

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANDRE V. FLORES, JR., individually and in  
behalf of all other persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

—against—

MYCHOLAS, INC.; THE BAGEL STORE,  
INC.; MYLES MACCHIO; SCOTT  
ROSSILLO; and SUSAN ROSSILLO; jointly  
and severally,

Defendants.

12 CV 1978 (NG) (VMS)

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

1. The plaintiff, in behalf of other similarly situated current and former employees of the defendants who consent to become party plaintiffs, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 215(b), alleges that the defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*, and the defendants are liable to the plaintiff and party plaintiffs for unpaid or underpaid overtime compensation, and such other relief available by law.

2. The plaintiff further alleges, pursuant to N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 198(1-a) and 663(1), that the defendants violated the Minimum Wage Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 650, *et seq.*, and section 191 of the New York Labor Law, and the defendants are liable to the plaintiff for unpaid or underpaid overtime compensation, and such other relief available by law.

3. The plaintiff further alleges, pursuant to the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-d), that the defendants violated the same, N.Y. Lab. Law § 195(3), and that the plaintiff should be awarded of the defendants statutory damages, injunctive relief, and such other relief available by law.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. Jurisdiction of this action is conferred upon the Court by the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and further by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337.

5. Jurisdiction over all other claims is within the supplemental jurisdiction of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

6. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. The parties reside where set forth herein. A substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims alleged herein occurred in the judicial district of this Court.

### **PARTIES**

7. The plaintiff Andre V. Flores, Jr., is and was at all relevant times an adult residing in Kings County, New York.

8. The defendant Mycholas, Inc., is and was at all relevant times a New York business corporation with its office in Kings County.

9. The defendant The Bagel Store, Inc., is and was at all relevant times a New York business corporation with its office in Kings County.

10. Upon information and belief, the defendant Myles Macchio is an adult residing in Nassau County, New York.

11. Upon information and belief, the defendant Scott Rossillo is an adult residing in Nassau County, New York.

12. Upon information and belief, the defendant Susan Rossillo is an adult residing in Nassau County, New York.

### **COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), the plaintiff commences this action as to the plaintiff's claims arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act as a collective action in behalf of all similarly situated current and former employees of the defendants at any time since three years before the date of this complaint to the entry of judgment in this action who consent to become party plaintiffs.

14. The plaintiff and the putative party plaintiffs have had substantially similar jobs and compensation and have been subject to the defendants' common policies and practices of willfully violating the Fair Labor Standards Act as set forth in this complaint. The claims of the plaintiff stated herein are similar to those of the putative party plaintiffs.

### **FACTS**

15. At all relevant times, the defendants' business is a limited-service restaurant doing business as The Bagel Store and located at 247 Bedford Avenue, 349 Bedford Avenue, and 754 Metropolitan Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

16. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Myles Macchio was an owner, shareholder, officer, or manager of the defendants' business.

17. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Myles Macchio was an individual who actively participated in the business of the defendants, exercised substantial control over the functions of the employees of the defendants, including the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, and acted directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer.

18. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Myles Macchio had the capacity on behalf of the defendants to establish the wages and hours of the employees of the defendants.

19. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Scott Rossillo was an owner, shareholder, officer, or manager of the defendants' business.

20. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Scott Rossillo was an individual who actively participated in the business of the defendants, exercised substantial control over the functions of the employees of the defendants, including the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, and acted directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer.

21. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Scott Rossillo had the capacity on behalf of the defendants to establish the wages and hours of the employees of the defendants.

22. The defendant Scott Rossillo was a part owner of the defendants' business.

23. The defendant Scott Rossillo hired employees such as the plaintiff, Andrew Flores, and Leonard Morales.

24. The defendant Scott Rossillo fired employees such as the plaintiff, Andrew Flores, and Leonard Morales.

25. The defendant Scott Rossillo once altered the plaintiff's schedule from the plaintiff's normal schedule by taking away all of the plaintiff's hours one workweek.

26. The defendant Scott Rossillo would regularly send employees who were doing their jobs too slowly home early.

27. The defendant Scott Rossillo decided how much to pay the plaintiff.

28. The defendant Scott Rossillo distributed wages to employees and would have employees sign receipts that indicated the employees received their cash wages.

29. The defendant Scott Rossillo maintained employee records such as schedules and time cards.

30. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Susan Rossillo was an owner, shareholder, officer, or manager of the defendants' business.

31. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Susan Rossillo was an individual who actively participated in the business of the defendants, exercised substantial control over the functions of the employees of the defendants, including the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, and acted directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer.

32. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the defendant Susan Rossillo had the capacity on behalf of the defendants to establish the wages and hours of the employees of the defendants.

33. The defendant Susan Rossillo was a part owner of the defendants' business.

34. The defendant Susan Rossillo managed payroll.

35. In one instance, the plaintiff disputed the amount of hours the defendants claimed he worked, so the plaintiff texted the defendant Susan Rossillo who checked the time cards and then ensured that the plaintiff was paid an amount additional to how much he was originally paid in order to reflect how much the plaintiff actually worked in that week according to the timecards.

36. The defendant Susan Rossillo managed the time cards for all employees.

37. If there was anything wrong with the amount of payment that the employees received, the employees would contact the defendant Susan Rossillo to have it corrected.

38. The defendants are associated and are joint employers, act in the interest of each other with respect to the employees of the defendants, have common policies and practices as to wages and hours, and share control over the defendants' employees.

39. The defendants employed the plaintiff approximately from May 2007 until January 29, 2012.

40. The defendants employed the plaintiff as a cook and delicatessen server.

41. The plaintiff worked for the defendants approximately between eight and nine hours per day six days per week.

42. The defendants paid the plaintiff the minimum hourly wage.

43. The defendants paid the plaintiff in cash.

44. The plaintiff and party plaintiffs worked in excess of forty hours each workweek, yet the defendants willfully failed to pay the plaintiff and party plaintiffs overtime compensation of one and one-half times their regular rate of pay.

45. The defendants failed to provide the plaintiff with a statement with each payment of wages.

46. Upon information and belief, while the defendants employed the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, the defendants failed to post or keep posted notices explaining the minimum wage rights of employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the New York Labor Law, and the plaintiff and party plaintiffs were uninformed of their rights during such times.

47. Upon information and belief, while the defendants employed the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, the defendants failed to maintain accurate and sufficient records.

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF:  
FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT**

48. The plaintiff, on behalf of the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 47 as if they were set forth again herein.

49. At all relevant times, the defendants, employers, employed the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, employees, within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d), (e)(1), and (g).

50. The business activities of the defendants are related and performed through unified operation or common control for a common business purpose and constitute an enterprise, within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).

51. The enterprise of the defendants employs employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or in handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce, within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a)(i).

52. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the enterprise of the defendants has had an annual gross volume of sales made or business done not less than of \$500,000, exclusive of separate retail excise taxes, within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a)(ii).

53. Therefore, upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the plaintiff and party plaintiffs have been employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a).

54. The defendants in many workweeks willfully and repeatedly violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 207 and 215(a)(2), by failing to pay the plaintiff and party plaintiffs at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of forty hours in a workweek.

55. By 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), the defendants are liable to the plaintiff and party plaintiffs for unpaid or underpaid overtime compensation.

56. The plaintiff and party plaintiffs are further entitled to recover of the defendants an equal amount as liquidated damages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

57. The defendants failed to post notices of the defendants' employees' rights under the law, required by 29 C.F.R. § 516.4.

58. Because of the defendants' failure to post notices of the defendants' employees' rights under the law, the plaintiff and party plaintiffs are entitled to the equitable tolling of their claims during the time that the defendants failed to post such notices.

59. The foregoing conduct, as alleged, constitutes a willful violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act within the meaning of the Portal-to-Portal Act, 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF:  
MINIMUM WAGE ACT**

60. The plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 59 as if they were set forth again herein.

61. At all relevant times, the defendants, employers, employed the plaintiff, an employee, within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2(5)–(7), 190(2)–(3), and 651(5)–(6), and N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 12, § 146-3.2.

62. The defendants willfully violated the plaintiff's rights by failing to pay or underpaying the plaintiff overtime compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the plaintiff's regular rate of pay for the hours the plaintiff worked in excess of forty per workweek, in violation of N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 12, § 146-1.4.

63. The defendants' failure to pay the plaintiff the foregoing timely is a violation of section 191 of the New York Labor Law.

64. By N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 198(1-a) and 663(1), the defendants are liable to the plaintiff for unpaid or underpaid overtime compensation.



65. The plaintiff is further entitled to recover of the defendants liquidated damages pursuant to the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-a), and the Minimum Wage Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 663(1).

66. The defendants failed to post notices of the defendants' employees' rights under the law, required by N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 198(d) and 661 and N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 12, § 146-2.4.

67. Because of the defendants' failure to post notices of the defendants' employees' rights under the law, the plaintiff is entitled to the equitable tolling of the plaintiff's claims during the time that the defendants failed to post such notices.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF:  
WAGE THEFT PREVENTION ACT**

68. The plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 67 as if they were set forth again herein.

69. The defendants failed to furnish to the plaintiff with each wage payment a statement listing the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked, and the number of overtime hours worked; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; and net wages; in violation of the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 195(3) and N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 12, § 146-2.3.

70. Due to the defendants' violation of the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 195(3) and N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 12, § 146-2.3, the plaintiff should be awarded of the

defendants statutory damages of \$100.00 per workweek that the violation occurred, up to a maximum of \$2,500.00, pursuant to N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-d).

71. Further, the defendants, including the defendants' officers, agents, employees, and those persons in active concert or participation with the defendants, should be permanently enjoined from violating the Wage Theft Prevention Act, § 195(1)–(3), pursuant to the same, N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-b)–(1-d).

**FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:  
DECLARATORY RELIEF**

72. The plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 71 as if they were set forth again herein.

73. Pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–02, and Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the plaintiff may obtain declaratory relief.

74. The defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, Minimum Wage Act, section 191 of the New York Labor Law, and the Wage Theft Prevention Act.

75. It is in the public interest to have these declarations of rights recorded.

76. A declaratory judgment serves the useful purpose of clarifying and settling the legal issues in this action.

77. A declaratory judgment would terminate and afford relief from uncertainty, insecurity, and controversy giving rise to this action.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

78. Wherefore, the plaintiff, on behalf of the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, prays this Court grant as relief:

- a. designation of this action as a collective action in behalf of the party plaintiffs and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated

putative party plaintiffs, apprising them of the pendency of this action, permitting them to assert timely claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act in this action by filing individual consents to become party plaintiffs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and appointing the plaintiff and the plaintiff's attorneys to represent the party plaintiffs;

b. a declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Minimum Wage Act, section 191 of the New York Labor Law, and the Wage Theft Prevention Act;

c. an award of unpaid or underpaid overtime compensation, due under the Fair Labor Standards Act;

d. an award of liquidated damages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

e. an award of unpaid or underpaid overtime compensation, due under the Minimum Wage Act and section 191 of the New York Labor Law;

f. an award of liquidated damages pursuant to the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-a), and the Minimum Wage Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 663(1);

g. an award of statutory damages for the defendants' violation of the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 195(3), pursuant to the same, N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-d);

h. a permanent injunction restraining the defendants, including the defendants' officers, agents, employees, and those persons in active concert or participation with the defendants, from violating the Wage Theft Prevention Act, N.Y. Lab. Law § 195(3), pursuant to the same, N.Y. Lab. Law § 198(1-d);

- i. if liquidated damages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), are not awarded, an award of prejudgment interest pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961;
- j. an award of prejudgment interest pursuant to the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules, §§ 5001–02;
- k. an award of postjudgment interest pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961 and/or the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules, § 5003;
- l. an award of the attorney’s fees, costs, and further expenses up to fifty dollars, of this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 198(1)–(2) and 663(1); and
- m. such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

#### **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the plaintiff, on behalf of the plaintiff and party plaintiffs, demands a trial by jury on all questions of fact raised by the complaint.

LAW OFFICE OF JUSTIN A. ZELLER, P.C.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
John M. Gurrieri  
jmgurrieri@zellerlegal.com  
Brandon D. Sherr  
bsherr@zellerlegal.com  
Justin A. Zeller  
jazeller@zellerlegal.com  
277 Broadway, Suite 408  
New York, N.Y. 10007-2036  
Telephone: (212) 229-2249  
Facsimile: (212) 229-2246  
**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF**

Dated: New York, New York  
February 2, 2017